

UNITED STATE: EPARTMENT OF COMMEI Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADE Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR 07/917,503 07/21/92 BOWLES RAY, G E3M1/0913 ROGER L. MAXWELL PAPER NUMBER ART UNIT JOHNSON & GIBBS 100 FOUNDERS SQUARE 900 JACKSON ST. 2308 DALLAS, TX 75202-4499 DATE MAILED: 09/13/93 This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application. COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS This application has been examined Responsive to communication filed on ____ _____ This action is made final. month(s), O days from the date of this lett A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire.... Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(8) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION: Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892. 2. Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948. Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449. 4. Notice of informal Patent Application, Form PTO-152. Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474. **SUMMARY OF ACTION** 1. X Claims 1-22 2. Claims _ Claims ____ 4. X Claims 1-22 are subject to restriction or election requirement. 7. X This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes. 8. Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action. 9. The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on _ are acceptable. not acceptable (see explanation or Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948). 10.

The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on _____ has (have) been approved by the examiner. disapproved by the examiner (see explanation). 11. The proposed drawing correction, filed on _______, has been approved. I disapproved (see explanation). 12. \square Acknowledgment is made of the claim for priority under U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has \square been received \square not been received been filed in parent application, serial no. ____ _____; filed on _

EXAMINER'S ACTION

13. \Box Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in

accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

ימפ_ים. יישמו. פכב. וחדק∕

14. Other

Serial No. 07/917,503 Art Unit 2308

Claims 1-22 are presented for examination.

- 2. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is <u>clearly indicative</u> of the invention to which the claims are directed. The examiner believes that the title of the invention is broad. A descriptive title indicative of the invention will help in proper indexing, classifying, searching, etc. See MPEP 606.01.
- 3. This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes only. See PTO-948 for objections to the drawings. Formal drawings will be required when the application is allowed.

Furthermore, Fig. 5 of the drawings is objected to by the examiner because there is no Fig. 5 in the drawings. Applicant should change the phrase "Fig. 5 (which consists of Fig. 5a and Fig. 5b) is a block diagram" (page 8, lines 19-20 of the specification of the invention) by the phrase --Fig. 5a and Fig. 5b are block diagrams-- or make a separate Fig. 5 in the drawings having two adjacent blocks labelled as Fig. 5a and Fig. 5b respectively.

4. Applicant should provide serial numbers and current status of all co-pending US Patent applications disclosed on pages 1-2 of the specification.

Furthermore, the specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor

Serial No. 07/917,503
 Art Unit 2308

errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

5. Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The examiner notes the following ambiguities.

As per claim 1, it is unclear if both the "software condition" and "hardware condition" are required to generate a single interrupt. Clarification and/or rephrasing is required.

As per claims 2-11, these claims incorporate the deficiencies of the parent claim.

As per claim 12, it is unclear if both the "software condition" and "hardware condition" are required to generate a single interrupt. Clarification and/or rephrasing is required.

As per claims 13-22, these claims incorporate the deficiencies of the parent claim.

- 6. Claims 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, fourth paragraph, as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. The above claims are method claims and do not further limit the step/steps of the respective previous claims.
- 7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Serial No. 07/917,503

Art Unit 2308

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8. Claims 1-5 and 12-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent 4,344,133 issued to Bruce, Jr. et al.

As per claim 1, Bruce, Jr. et al. teach the claimed:

"means for indicating a software condition; means for indicating a hardware condition": Bruce's means for indicating a software condition; means for indicating a hardware condition (see col. 1, lines 49-52); and

"means for generating said interrupt in response to the assertion of said interrupt request line ..." (lines 6-9):

Bruce's means for generating the interrupt in response to the assertion of the interrupt request line ... (see col. 8, lines 46-54).

As per claim 2, Bruce teaches the "means for generating said interrupt" in col. 7, lines 63-65.

As per claim 3, Bruce teaches the "means for enabling" and "means for asserting" in col. 8, lines 51-56.

As per claim 4, Bruce teaches the "programmable register that outputs a software enable signal" in col. 1, lines 62-64.

As per claim 5, Bruce teaches the "means for indicating said hardware condition comprises at least one hardware circuit, and

Serial No. 07/917,503

Art Unit 2308

wherein each of said at least one hardware circuit outputs a hardware enable signal" in col. 2, lines 52-53.

As per claims 12-16, these claims recite methods which parallel apparatus claims 1-5. In teaching the construction and use of the device, the reference of Bruce, Jr. et al. inherently teaches corresponding methods.

- 9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant is urged to consider the references. However, the references should be evaluated by what they suggest to one versed in the art, rather than by their specific disclosure.
- 10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gopal C. Ray whose telephone number is (703) 305-9647.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

GOPAL C. RAY PATENT EXAMINER GROUP 230 O